



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/098,543	03/18/2002	Mari Omori	220963US2S	4953

22850 7590 12/30/2005

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.  
1940 DUKE STREET  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

PATEL, FAHD

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2194

DATE MAILED: 12/30/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/098,543

Applicant(s)

OMORI ET AL.

Examiner

Fahd Patel

Art Unit

2194

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 November 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 29-49 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 29-49 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 May 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

  
WILLIAM THOMSON  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

***Detailed Action***

1. Claims 29-49 are pending in this application.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. **Claim 48 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.**

4. Claim 48 recites the limitation "the request computer readable program" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

**6. Claims 29-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ghafir et al. (U.S Patent 6,202,159), hereafter Ghafir.**

7. As per claim 29, Ghafir teaches

acquiring a request for an information processing service provided through a network (col. 3, line 66);

operating the information processing service based on the request (col. 3, line 67);

detecting an event which requests an additional information processing service associated with the information processing service (col. 3, lines 66-67);

when the event is detected, referring to a library in which invocation of an additional function of providing the additional information processing service is defined (100, Fig. 2A; col. 4, lines 3-5); and

based on a reference result of the library, requesting the additional function to execute processing (col. 3, lines 12-15).

8. As per claim 30, Ghafir teaches

detecting a linkage event with which another additional information processing service is requested from the additional information processing service (col. 3, line 66),

when the linkage event is detected, referring to the library in which invocation of another additional function of providing said another additional information processing service is defined (100, Fig. 2A; col. 4, lines 3-5), and

based on a reference result of the library, requesting said another additional function of providing said another additional information processing service to execute processing (col. 3, lines 12-15).

9. As per claim 31, Ghafir teaches that the additional function is commonly used by a plurality of information processing services (col. 3, lines 25-27).

10. As per claim 46, Ghafir teaches that a request to the additional function to execute processing is performed using an adaptor which has a processing method and is invoked from the library (120 Fig. 2A; col. 4, lines 12-20).

11. As per claim 47, Ghafir teaches that the additional information processing service and the adapter are correlated with each other by a table, and the adaptor is selected using the table (116, Fig. 2A; col. 4, lines 8-11; col. 7, 26-32).

12. As per claim 32, it is rejected for the same reasons as claim 29 above with the addition of the following expanded limitations:

operating the information processing service based on the request *and recording data that represents an operation state of the information processing service* (col. 4, lines 5-9, 33-55);

based on a reference result of the library, requesting the additional function to execute processing *and providing the recorded data that represents the operation state to the additional function* (col. 4, lines 5-9, 33-55).

13. As per claim 33, it is rejected for the same reasons as claim 30, 32 above with the addition of the following expanded limitations:

based on a reference result of the library, requesting said another additional function of providing said another additional information processing service to execute processing *and providing the recorded data that represents the operation state of said another additional information processing service to said another additional function* (col. 4, lines 5-9, 33-55).

14. As per claim 34, it is rejected for the same reasons as claim 31 above.

15. As per claims 35-37, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 29-31, 46-47 above.

16. As per claims 38-39, 48, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 29-31, 46-47 above.

17. As per claims 40-41, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 29-31, 46-47 above.

18. As per claims 42-43, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 29-31, 46-47 above.

19. As per claims 44-49, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 29-31, 46-47 above.

20. As per claims 45, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 29-31, 46-47 above.

### ***Response to Arguments***

**21. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 29-49 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.**

22. Applicant is reminded that claims are read according to their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the specification and that limitations from the specification are not introduced into the claim during examination; see MPEP §2106 [R-3] IIA.

### ***Conclusion***

23. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Cook (U.S Patent 5,621,892) teaches managing alerts in a distributed network.

24. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Fahd Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-1044. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am - 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Thompson can be reached on (571) 272-3718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.



Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

FHP

  
WILLIAM THOMSON  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER